

Appl. No. 10/605,521  
Amdt. dated June 03, 2005  
Reply to Office action of February 17, 2005

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

#### 1. Objection to the drawings:

5 The drawings are objected to for not showing the claimed features of a first  
conductive trace formed on the first wiring layer, as recited in claim 1, and the  
conductive traces disposed on separate wiring layers, as recited in claim 3.

#### **Response:**

10 Claims 1 and 9-12 have been amended to overcome this rejection. Claims 1 and  
9 now recite that the first conductive trace is **formed in a first layer** of a printed circuit  
board. The limitations reciting the other conductive traces are amended in a similar  
manner. This limitation is fully supported in the specification and in Figures 3 and 4 of  
the instant application. As shown in Fig.4, the printed circuit board 34 contains first  
layer 16 and second layer 18 in which the four claimed conductive traces are formed. As  
a result of the amendments to the claims, all claimed limitations are now shown in the  
15 drawings, and acceptance of the drawings is respectfully requested.

#### 2. Rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C., first paragraph:

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected due to the unclear terms first and second wiring  
layers. Claim 3 was rejected for reasons of record.

#### 20 **Response:**

As explained with respect to the drawings objection above, claims 1 and 9 have  
both been amended to overcome this rejection. Claim 3 has been cancelled, and is  
therefore no longer in need of consideration. Reconsideration of pending claims 1, 2,  
and 9-12 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/605,521  
Amdt. dated June 03, 2005  
Reply to Office action of February 17, 2005

3. Rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C., second paragraph:

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected due to the unclear terms first and second wiring layers. Claims 3, 7, and 8 were rejected for reasons of record.

5           **Response:**

As explained above, claims 1 and 9 have both been amended to overcome this rejection. Claims 3, 7, and 8 have been cancelled, and are therefore no longer in need of consideration. Reconsideration of pending claims 1, 2, and 9-12 is respectfully requested.

10

4. Rejections of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liou (6,037,649) in view of Gardner (6,452,247) for reasons of record.

**Response:**

15           Independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to overcome this rejection. The other independent claim 3 has been cancelled and is no longer in need of consideration. Claims 1 and 9 have now been amended to state that "the first conductive trace is electrically connected to the fourth conductive trace through the first via plug, the second conductive trace, the second via plug, the third conductive trace, and the third via plug  
20 with no intervening connections. This amendment is supported by Fig.3 and paragraph [0016] of the specification.

On the other hand, Liou teaches an inductor structure comprising three layers instead of two. Liou does not teach connections of the four conductive traces and the

Appl. No. 10/605,521  
Amdt. dated June 03, 2005  
Reply to Office action of February 17, 2005

three via plugs on two layers without relying on intervening connections. Instead, Liou utilizes a third layer to make intervening connections for connecting conductive traces formed on the first and second layers to each other.

- 5           Since neither Liou nor Gardner teach this claimed limitation, claims 1 and 9 are patentable over the cited prior art. Claims 2 and 10-12 are dependent on claims 1 and 9, respectively, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 9 are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 2, and 9-12 is respectfully requested.

10   4. Interview summary:

A telephone interview was conducted between US Patent Agent Scott Margo (Reg. # 56,277) and Examiner Ori Nadav on May 19, 2005. The 35 U.S.C. 112 and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claim 1 were discussed.

- 15           Regarding the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections of claim 1, the examiner proposed changing the limitation "a first conductive trace formed on a first wiring layer of a printed circuit board" to read "a first conductive trace formed in a first surface of a printed circuit board" since the term "first wiring layer" was unclear. However, upon further inspection of claim 1 after the telephone interview, Mr. Margo discovered that the term "first layer"
- 20   is more appropriate than "first surface" since the layer is not necessarily on the surface of the printed circuit board.

- Regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 1, an agreement was made that the Liou patent (6,037,649) contains numerous conductive traces on first and second layers
- 25   that are joined together through intervening connections to conductive traces on a third layer. The examiner then suggested that claim 1 be amended to state that no intervening

Appl. No. 10/605,521  
Amdt. dated June 03, 2005  
Reply to Office action of February 17, 2005

connections are required for the conductive traces in order to distinguish from Liou.

In view of the patentable differences between the pending claims of the instant  
5 application and the cited prior art, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of  
Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

10



Date: June 3, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526  
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.  
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562  
15 Facsimile: 806-498-6673  
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. The time in D.C.  
is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.

20